Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the proposed development of a solar photovoltaic (PV) energy facility near Sigma, Sasolburg, in the Free State Province

CTS21_283
Savannah

Site visit report (Phase 2)

For

CTS Heritage

03 February 2021

Prof Marion Bamford
Palaeobotanist
P Bag 652, WITS 2050
Johannesburg, South Africa
Marion.bamford@wits.ac.za

Expertise of Specialist

The Palaeontologist Consultant: Prof Marion Bamford
Qualifications: PhD (Wits Univ, 1990); FRSSAf, ASSAf
Experience: 32 years research; 24 years PIA studies

Declaration of Independence

This report has been compiled by Professor Marion Bamford, of the University of the Witwatersrand, sub-contracted by CTS Heritage, Cape Town, South Africa. The views expressed in this report are entirely those of the author and no other interest was displayed during the decision making process for the Project.

Specialist: Prof Marion Bamford

Signature: 

Executive Summary

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the proposed Becrux Solar PV Project One (Pty) Ltd development of a 10MW ac Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Energy Facility and associated infrastructure on Portion 1 of the Farm Saltbery Plain 137 and the Remaining Extent of the Farm Zamdela 449, located near Sasolburg and the Sigma Substation

To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed on 24th January 2022 by Rick Tolchard for the proposed development.

The two proposed sites lie on the palaeontologically very highly sensitive rocks of the Vryheid Formation (Ecca Group, Karoo Supergroup) that could potentially preserve impression fossils of the Glossopteris flora. The site visit confirmed that there were NO FOSSILS visible on either site or along the route for the grid connection. Nonetheless, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. Based on this information it is recommended that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the developer/ environmental officer/ other designated responsible person once excavations/drilling activities have commenced.

As far as the palaeontology is concerned, the project should be authorised. There is no preferred alternative and there are no no-go areas.

Table of Contents

1. Background

Becrux Solar PV Project One (Pty) Ltd is proposing the development of a 10MW ac Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Energy Facility and associated infrastructure on Portion 1 of the Farm Saltbery Plain 137 and the Remaining Extent of the Farm Zamdela 449, located near Sasolburg in the Metsimaholo Local Municipality, which forms part of the Fezile Dabi District Municipality in the Free State Province. The purpose of the facility will be to generate electricity for exclusive use by Sasol Limited (Figures 1, 2).

To evacuate the generated power to Sasol Limited, a 33kV overhead power line will be established to connect the proposed 33kV onsite MV substation to the existing Sigma Substation. Two alternative sites (i.e., Site Alternative 1 and Site Alternative 2) have been identified for the assessment and placement of the solar facility infrastructure. Grid connection corridors have been identified for each site for the assessment and suitable placement of the grid connection infrastructure within the corridor.

For Site Alternative 2, the grid connection corridor will up to 200m wide, extending to ~400m around the footprint of the Sigma substation, and up to 500m long. For Site Alternative 2, the grid connection corridor will be up to 70m wide, extending up to ~400m around the footprint of the existing Sigma Substation, and up to 2.1km long.

A Palaeontological Impact Assessment was requested for the Becrux Sigma PV facility south of Sasolburg. To comply with the regulations of the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA), a site visit (phase 2) Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) was completed for the proposed development and is reported herein.

Table 1: Specialist report requirements in terms of Appendix 6 of the EIA Regulations (amended 2017)

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	**Relevant section in report**
ai	Details of the specialist who prepared the report	Appendix B
aii	The expertise of that person to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae	Appendix B
b	A declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority	Page
c	An indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared	Section 1
ci	An indication of the quality and age of the base data used for the specialist report: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map accessed – date of this report	Yes
cii	A description of existing impacts on the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change	Section 5

	A specialist report prepared in terms of the Environmental Impact Regulations of 2017 must contain:	**Relevant section in report**
d	The date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment	N/A
e	A description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process	Section 2
f	The specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the activity and its associated structures and infrastructure	Section 4
g	An identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers	N/A
h	A map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	N/A
i	A description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	Section 5
j	A description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives, on the environment	Section 4
k	Any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr	Section 8, Appendix A
l	Any conditions for inclusion in the environmental authorisation	N/A
m	Any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorisation	Section 8, Appendix A
ni	A reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised	Section 6
nii	If the opinion is that the proposed activity or portions thereof should be authorised, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan	Sections 6, 8
o	A description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study	N/A
p	A summary and copies if any comments that were received during any consultation process	N/A
q	Any other information requested by the competent authority.	N/A



Figure 1: Google Earth map of the proposed development with the relevant landmarks.

Figure 2: Google Earth map to show the proposed Becrux Sigma PV Facility just south of Sasolburg with the two alternatives as indicated.

2. Methods and Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this study were to undertake a PIA and provide feasible management measures to comply with the requirements of SAHRA.
The methods employed to address the ToR included:

1. Consultation of geological maps, literature, palaeontological databases, published and unpublished records to determine the likelihood of fossils occurring in the affected areas. Sources included records housed at the Evolutionary Studies Institute at the University of the Witwatersrand and SAHRA databases;
2. Where necessary, site visits by a qualified palaeontologist to locate any fossils and assess their importance (*not applicable to this assessment*);
3. Where appropriate, collection of unique or rare fossils with the necessary permits for storage and curation at an appropriate facility (*not applicable to this assessment*); and
4. Determination of fossils' representivity or scientific importance to decide if the fossils can be destroyed or a representative sample collected (*not applicable to this assessment*).

3. Geology and Palaeontology

i. Project location and geological context



Figure 3: Geological map of the area around Sasolburg with the proposed project indicated within the pink and purple rectangles Abbreviations of the rock types are explained in Table 2. Map enlarged from the Geological Survey 1: 250 000 map 2626 west Rand.

Table 2: Explanation of symbols for the geological map and approximate ages (Johnson et al., 2006). SG = Supergroup; Fm = Formation; Ma = million years; grey shading = formations impacted by the project.

Symbol	Group/Formation	Lithology	Approximate Age
Qs	Quaternary	Alluvium, sand, calcrete	Neogene, ca 2.5 Ma to present
Jd	Jurassic dykes	Dolerite dykes, intrusive	Jurassic, approx. 180 Ma
Pv	Vryheid Fm, Ecca Group, Karoo SG	Shales, sandstone, coal	Early Permian, Middle Ecca

The project lies in the central part of the Main Karoo Basin and in the Vereeniging-Sasolburg Coalfield (Figure 3) that has deep deposits of the Vryheid Formation with five coal seams.

The Karoo Supergroup rocks cover a very large proportion of South Africa and extend from the northeast (east of Pretoria) to the southwest and across to almost the KwaZulu Natal south coast. It is bounded along the southern margin by the Cape Fold Belt and along the northern margin by the much older Transvaal Supergroup rocks. Representing some 120 million years (300 – 183Ma), the Karoo Supergroup rocks have preserved a diversity of fossil plants, insects, vertebrates and invertebrates.

During the Carboniferous Period South Africa was part of the huge continental landmass known as Gondwanaland and it was positioned over the South Pole. Melting of the icesheets deposited sediments in the Karoo Basin. These are the oldest rocks in the system and are exposed around the outer part of the ancient Karoo Basin, and are known as the Dwyka Group. They comprise tillites, diamictites, mudstones, siltstones and sandstones that were deposited as the basin filled (Johnson et al., 2006).

Overlying the Dwyka Group rocks are rocks of the Ecca Group that are Early Permian in age. There are eleven formations recognised in this group but they do not all extend throughout the Karoo Basin. In the Free State, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu Natal, from the base upwards are the Pietermaritzburg Formation, **Vryheid Formation** and the Volksrust Formation. All of these sediments have varying proportions of sandstones, mudstones, shales and siltstones and represent shallow to deep water settings, deltas, rivers, streams and overbank depositional environments.

Overlying the Ecca Group are the rocks of the Beaufort Group that has been divided into the lower Adelaide Subgroup for the Upper Permian strata, and the Tarkastad Subgroup for the Early to Middle Triassic strata. As with the older Karoo sediments, the formations vary across the Karoo Basin.

Large exposures of Jurassic dolerite dykes occur throughout the area. These intruded through the Karoo sediments around 183 million years ago at about the same time as

the Drakensberg basaltic eruption. Much younger Quaternary Alluvium has filled many of the river and stream valleys.

ii. Palaeontological context

The palaeontological sensitivity of the area under consideration is presented in Figure 4. The site for development is in the Early Permian Vryheid Formation that could potentially preserve plant impressions of the *Glossopteris* flora, but no vertebrates. This flora includes the diverse glossopterids (extinct seed ferns), lycopods, sphenophytes, ferns and early gymnosperms (Anderson and Anderson, 1985; Plumstead, 1969; Appendix A). Borehole cores for the Sigma Coal mine show that the uppermost coal seam is 180 m below the surface and is covered by shale to 140m (Snyman, 1998, fig 18). Thick dolerite is common and only the shales would preserve fossils. The dolerite and sandstone do not preserve fossils.



Figure 4: SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map for the site for the proposed Sigma PV facility. Background colours indicate the following degrees of sensitivity: red = very highly sensitive; orange/yellow = high; green = moderate; blue = low; grey = insignificant/zero.

iii. Site visit observations

Rick Tolchard visited the two proposed areas on 24th January and walked through the area. Photographic stops and observations are listed in Table 3 below and relate to the pins in Figure 5. All the photographs in Figure 6 were taken by Tolchard.

NO FOSSILS were seen in the project areas or along the proposed grid connection. In Site 1 the vegetation is dense grass but visibility of the soils was good. In Site 2, the land has been ploughed recently and there were no fossils or even any rocky outcrops that could potentially preserve fossil plants. The grid connection route is along a road and servitude and no fossils were seen.

Figure 5: Annotated Google Earth map of site visit GPS points (see table 4)

Table 3: Site visit observations

GPS points	Observations	Figure
Stop 1 – Site 1 S26°50'56.21894" E27°50'19.62237"	Generally flat topography with thick cover of grasses and some paths through the field. No rocky outcrops and no fossils found	6A,B
Stop 2 26°50'57.34929" E27°50'14.26392"	Generally flat topography with thick cover of grasses and some paths through the field. No rocky outcrops and no fossils found	6C, D

Stop 3 S26°51’03.08945” E27°50’05.71357”	Generally flat topography with thick cover of grasses and some paths through the field. No rocky outcrops and no fossils found	7A-D
Stop 4 - Site 2 S26°51’03.09” E27°48’38.33”	Generally flat topography, ploughed with a well developed mealie crop. No rocky outcrops and no fossils found	8A
Stop 5 S26°51’38.93” E27°48’40.58”	Mealie fields	
Grid connection route	Generally flat topography, disturbed ground and roads. No fossils and no rocky outcrops.	8B-D

Figure 6: Site visit photographs for the Becrux PV facility near Sasolburg. A – Site 1 - view across the field towards the township. B – close-up of the dense grasses covering the land. C – close-up of the sandy soils alongside the track. D - another section of the open area.

Figure 7: Photographs of site visit for the Becrux PV facility near Sasolburg, site 1. A – view across the field with thick grass cover. B – close-up of the soils where the grasses are thinner. C – another view across the field from the southern corner. D – thick grass cover, general flat topography.

Figure 8: Photographs from the site visit for the Becrux PV facility near Sasolburg. A – Site 2 is a mealie field. No fossils, B –C - route for the grid connection. D. View of the substation and Sigma mine from a distance. Foreground shows sandy soils and no rocky outcrops.

4. Impact assessment

An assessment of the potential impacts to possible palaeontological resources considers the criteria encapsulated in Table 4:

Table 4a: Criteria for assessing impacts

PART A: DEFINITION AND CRITERIA		
Criteria for ranking of the SEVERITY/NATURE of environmental impacts	**H**	Substantial deterioration (death, illness or injury). Recommended level will often be violated. Vigorous community action.
	M	Moderate/ measurable deterioration (discomfort). Recommended level will occasionally be violated. Widespread complaints.
	L	Minor deterioration (nuisance or minor deterioration). Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	L+	Minor improvement. Change not measurable/ will remain in the current range. Recommended level will never be violated. Sporadic complaints.
	M+	Moderate improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. No observed reaction.
	H+	Substantial improvement. Will be within or better than the recommended level. Favourable publicity.
Criteria for ranking the DURATION of impacts	**L**	Quickly reversible. Less than the project life. Short term
	M	Reversible over time. Life of the project. Medium term
	H	Permanent. Beyond closure. Long term.
Criteria for ranking the SPATIAL SCALE of impacts	**L**	Localised - Within the site boundary.
	M	Fairly widespread – Beyond the site boundary. Local
	H	Widespread – Far beyond site boundary. Regional/ national
PROBABILITY (of exposure to impacts)	**H**	Definite/ Continuous
	M	Possible/ frequent
	L	Unlikely/ seldom

Table 4b: Impact Assessment

PART B: Assessment		
SEVERITY/NATURE	**H**	-
	M	-
	L	Dolerite and soils do not preserve plant fossils; There records from the Vryheid formation of plant in this region but none was seen on the site visit. The impact would be negligible.
	L+	-
	M+	-
	H+	-

DURATION	**L**	-
	M	-
	H	Where manifest, the impact will be permanent.
SPATIAL SCALE	**L**	Since the only possible fossils within the area would be fossil plants from the *Glossopteris* flora in the shales, the spatial scale will be localised within the site boundary.
	M	-
	H	-
PROBABILITY	**H**	**-**
	M	**-**
	L	It is extremely unlikely that any fossils would be found in the loose soils and sand that cover the area and will be excavated. No fossils were seen on the site walkthrough. Nonetheless, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the eventual EMPr.

Based on the nature of the project, surface activities may impact upon the fossil heritage if preserved in the development footprint. The geological structures suggest that the rocks are the correct and age and type to contain fossils, however, no fossils were seen on the surface and there were no rocky outcrop that could preserve fossils.. Since there is a small chance that fossils from the Vryheid Formation could occur below the surface and may be disturbed, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol has been added to this report. Taking account of the defined criteria, the potential impact to fossil heritage resources is extremely low.

5. Assumptions and uncertainties

Based on the geology of the area and the palaeontological record as we know it, it can be assumed that the formation and layout of the dolomites, sandstones, shales and sands are typical for the country and do contain fossil plant, insect, invertebrate and vertebrate material. The sands of the Quaternary period would not preserve fossils. The site visit and walkthrough confirmed that there are NO FOSSILS on either Site 1 or site 2 and not along the proposed route for the grid connection.

6. Recommendation

Based on the site visit and walkthrough there are no fossils on the land surface. It is unlikely that there would be any just below the surface because the borehole core from the Sigma mine indicates that there are thick layers of dolerite above the coal seams. Since there is a very small chance that fossils may occur in the below ground in the shales of the early Permian Vryheid Formation, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. If fossils are found by the environmental officer, or other responsible person once excavations for foundations and infrastructure have commenced then they

should be rescued and a palaeontologist called to assess and collect a representative sample. Based on the palaeontology, the project should be authorised because there are no fossils on site. There is no preferred site and there are no no-go areas.

7. References

Anderson, J.M., Anderson, H.M., 1985. Palaeoflora of Southern Africa: Prodromus of South African megafloras, Devonian to Lower Cretaceous. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam. 423 pp.

Johnson, M.R., van Vuuren, C.J., Visser, J.N.J., Cole, D.I., Wickens, H.deV., Christie, A.D.M., Roberts, D.L., Brandl, G., 2006. Sedimentary rocks of the Karoo Supergroup. In: Johnson, M.R., Anhaeusser, C.R. and Thomas, R.J., (Eds). The Geology of South Africa. Geological Society of South Africa, Johannesburg / Council for Geoscience, Pretoria. Pp 461 – 499.

Plumstead, E.P., 1969. Three thousand million years of plant life in Africa. Geological Society of southern Africa, Annexure to Volume LXXII. 72pp + 25 plates.

Snyman, C.P., 1998. Coal. In: Wilson, M.G.C., and Anhaeusser, C.P., (Eds). The Mineral Resources of South Africa: Handbook, Council for Geosciences 16, 136-205.

8. Chance Find Protocol

Monitoring Programme for Palaeontology – to commence once the excavations / drilling activities begin.

1. The following procedure is only required if fossils are seen on the surface and when drilling/excavations commence.
2. When excavations begin the rocks and must be given a cursory inspection by the environmental officer or designated person. Any fossiliferous material (plants, insects, bone, coal) should be put aside in a suitably protected place. This way the project activities will not be interrupted.
3. Photographs of similar fossils must be provided to the developer to assist in recognizing the fossil plants, vertebrates, invertebrates or trace fossils in the shales and mudstones (for example see Figure 9). This information will be built into the EMP's training and awareness plan and procedures.
4. Photographs of the putative fossils can be sent to the palaeontologist for a preliminary assessment.
5. If there is any possible fossil material found by the developer/environmental officer then the qualified palaeontologist sub-contracted for this project, should visit the site to inspect the selected material and check the dumps where feasible.
6. Fossil plants or vertebrates that are considered to be of good quality or scientific interest by the palaeontologist must be removed, catalogued and housed in a suitable institution where they can be made available for further study. Before the fossils are removed from the site a SAHRA permit must be obtained. Annual reports must be submitted to SAHRA as required by the relevant permits.
7. If no good fossil material is recovered then no site inspections by the palaeontologist will be necessary. A final report by the palaeontologist must be sent to SAHRA once the project has been completed and only if there are fossils.
8. If no fossils are found and the excavations have finished then no further monitoring is required.

9. Appendix A – Examples of fossils from the Vryheid Formation



Figure 9: Photographs of fossil plant impressions from the Vryheid formation, Ecca Group.

10. Appendix B – Details of specialists

Curriculum vitae (short) - Marion Bamford PhD

January 2022

I) Personal details

Surname	:	**Bamford**
First names	:	**Marion Kathleen**
Present employment	:	Professor; Director of the Evolutionary Studies Institute. Member Management Committee of the NRF/DST Centre of Excellence Palaeosciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa-
Telephone	:	+27 11 717 6690
Fax	:	+27 11 717 6694
Cell	:	082 555 6937
E-mail	:	marion.bamford@wits.ac.za ; marionbamford12@gmail.com

ii) Academic qualifications

Tertiary Education: All at the University of the Witwatersrand:
1980-1982: BSc, majors in Botany and Microbiology. Graduated April 1983.
1983: BSc Honours, Botany and Palaeobotany. Graduated April 1984.
1984-1986: MSc in Palaeobotany. Graduated with Distinction, November 1986.
1986-1989: PhD in Palaeobotany. Graduated in June 1990.

iii) Professional qualifications

Wood Anatomy Training (overseas as nothing was available in South Africa):
1994 - Service d'Anatomie des Bois, Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgium, by Roger Dechamps
1997 - Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France, by Dr Jean-Claude Koeniguer
1997 - Université Claude Bernard, Lyon, France by Prof Georges Barale, Dr Jean-Pierre Gros, and Dr Marc Philippe

iv) Membership of professional bodies/associations

Palaeontological Society of Southern Africa
Royal Society of Southern Africa - Fellow: 2006 onwards
Academy of Sciences of South Africa - Member: Oct 2014 onwards
International Association of Wood Anatomists - First enrolled: January 1991
International Organization of Palaeobotany – 1993+
Botanical Society of South Africa
South African Committee on Stratigraphy – Biostratigraphy - 1997 - 2016
SASQUA (South African Society for Quaternary Research) – 1997+
PAGES - 2008 –onwards: South African representative
ROCEEH / WAVE – 2008+
INQUA – PALCOMM – 2011+onwards

vii) Supervision of Higher Degrees

All at Wits University

Degree	Graduated/completed	Current
Honours	11	0
Masters	10	4
PhD	11	4
Postdoctoral fellows	10	5

viii) Undergraduate teaching

Geology II – Palaeobotany GEOL2008 – average 65 students per year
Biology III – Palaeobotany APES3029 – average 25 students per year
Honours – Evolution of Terrestrial Ecosystems; African Plio-Pleistocene Palaeoecology; Micropalaeontology – average 2-8 students per year.

ix) Editing and reviewing

Editor: Palaeontologia africana: 2003 to 2013; 2014 – Assistant editor
Guest Editor: Quaternary International: 2005 volume
Member of Board of Review: Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology: 2010 –

Review of manuscripts for ISI-listed journals: 25 local and international journals

x) Palaeontological Impact Assessments

Selected – list not complete:

- Thukela Biosphere Conservancy 1996; 2002 for DWAF
- Vioolsdrift 2007 for Xibula Exploration
- Rietfontein 2009 for Zitholele Consulting
- Bloeddrift-Baken 2010 for TransHex
- New Kleinfontein Gold Mine 2012 for Prime Resources (Pty) Ltd.
- Thabazimbi Iron Cave 2012 for Professional Grave Solutions (Pty) Ltd
- Delmas 2013 for Jones and Wagener
- Klipfontein 2013 for Jones and Wagener
- Platinum mine 2013 for Lonmin
- Syferfontein 2014 for Digby Wells
- Canyon Springs 2014 for Prime Resources
- Kimberley Eskom 2014 for Landscape Dynamics
- Yzermyne 2014 for Digby Wells
- Matimba 2015 for Royal HaskoningDV
- Commissiekraal 2015 for SLR
- Harmony PV 2015 for Savannah Environmental
- Glencore-Tweefontein 2015 for Digby Wells
- Umkomazi 2015 for JLB Consulting
- Ixia coal 2016 for Digby Wells
- Lambda Eskom for Digby Wells
- Alexander Scoping for SLR
- Perseus-Kronos-Aries Eskom 2016 for NGT
- Mala Mala 2017 for Henwood

- Modimolle 2017 for Green Vision
- Klipoortjie and Finaalspan 2017 for Delta BEC
- Ledjadja borrow pits 2018 for Digby Wells
- Lungile poultry farm 2018 for CTS
- Olienhout Dam 2018 for JP Celliers
- Isondlo and Kwasobabili 2018 for GCS
- Kanakies Gypsum 2018 for Cabanga
- Nababeep Copper mine 2018
- Glencore-Mbali pipeline 2018 for Digby Wells
- Remhoogte PR 2019 for A&HAS
- Bospoort Agriculture 2019 for Kudzala
- Overlooked Quarry 2019 for Cabanga
- Richards Bay Powerline 2019 for NGT
- Eilandia dam 2019 for ACO
- Eastlands Residential 2019 for HCAC
- Fairview MR 2019 for Cabanga
- Graspan project 2019 for HCAC
- Lieliefontein N&D 2019 for EnviroPro
- Skeerpoort Farm Mast 2020 for HCAC
- Vulindlela Eco village 2020 for 1World
- KwaZamakhule Township 2020 for Kudzala
- Sunset Copper 2020 for Digby Wells
- McCarthy-Salene 2020 for Prescali
- VLNR Lodge 2020 for HCAC
- Madadeni mixed use 2020 for EnviroPro
- Frankfort-Windfield Eskom Powerline 2020 for 1World
- Beaufort West PV Facility 2021 for ACO Associates
- Copper Sunset MR 2021 for Digby Wells
- Sannaspos PV facility 2021 for CTS Heritage
- Smithfield-Rouxville-Zastron PL 2021 for TheroServe

xi) Research Output

Publications by M K Bamford up to January 2022 peer-reviewed journals or scholarly books: over 150 articles published; 5 submitted/in press; 10 book chapters.
Scopus h-index = 30; Google scholar h-index = 35; -i10-index = 92
Conferences: numerous presentations at local and international conferences.

Mr Frederick Tolchard
Brief Curriculum Vitae – January 2022

Academic training

BA Archaeology – University of the Witwatersrand, graduated 2015
BSc (Honours) Palaeontology – University of the Witwatersrand, 2017 with distinction
MSc Palaeontology – University of the Witwatersrand, 2018 – 2019. Graduated 2020 with Distinction
PhD Palaeontology – Wits – 2020 - current

Field Experience

Honours Fieldtrip – Karoo biostratigraphy – April 2017
Research fieldwork – Elliot Formation with Prof Choiniere – April 2018, Nov 2018; April 2019; Sept 2021

Publications

Tolchard, F., Nesbitt, S.J., Desojo, J.B., Viglietti, P.A., Butler, R.J. and Choiniere, J.N., 2019. 'Rauisuchian' material from the lower Elliot Formation of South Africa: Implications for late Triassic biogeography and biostratigraphy. Journal of African Earth Sciences, 160, 103610.

Viglietti, P.A., McPhee, B.W., Bordy, E.M., Sciscio, L., Barrett, P.M., Benson, R.B.J., Wills, F., Tolchard, F., Choiniere, J.N., 2020. Biostratigraphy of the Scalenodontoides Assemblage Zone (Stormberg Group, Karoo Supergroup), South Africa. South African Journal of Geology 123, 239-248.

Tolchard F., Kammerer C., Butler R.J., Abdala F., Hendrickx C., Benoit J., Choinière J.N. (2021.) A very large new trirachodontid from the Triassic of South Africa and its implications for Gondwanan biostratigraphy. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology. DOI: 10.1080/02724634.2021.1929265.

PIA fieldwork projects

2018 May – Williston area – SARAO project, Digby Wells
2018 September – Lichtenburg PVs – CTS Heritage
2018 November – Nomalanga farming – Digby Wells
2019 January – Thubelisha coal – Digby Wells
2019 March – Matla coal – Digby Wells
2019 March – Musina-Machado SEZ – Digby Wells
2019 June – Temo coal – Digby Wells
2019 September – Makapanstad Agripark – Plantago
2020 January – Hendrina, Kwazamakuhle – Kudzala
2020 February – Hartebeestpoort Dam - Prescali
2020 March – Twyfelaar Coal mine – Digby Wells
2020 March – Ceres Borrow Pits – ACO Associates
2020 March – Copper Sunset Sand – Digby Wells
2020 October – Belfast loop and Expansion – Nsovo
2020 October – VLNR lodge Mapungubwe – HCAC
2020 November – Delmore Park BWSS - HCAC
2020 December – Kromdraai commercial – HCAC
2021 January – Welgedacht Siding – Elemental Sustainability
2021 March – Shango Kroonstad – Digby Wells

2021 May – Copper Sunset sand mining – Digby Wells
2021 August – New Largo Pit – Golder
2021 August – Khutsong Ext 8 housing, Carletonville, for Afzelia
2021 September – Lichtenburg PV facility – CTS Heritage
2021 October – Ogies South MR – beyondgreen
2021 October – Nooitgedacht Colliery MR - Shangoni